



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/573,634	03/28/2006	Tsuyoshi Nakajima	1085-012US01	9014
22919	7590	06/01/2009	EXAMINER	
GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP 1233 20TH STREET, NW, SUITE 700 WASHINGTON, DC 20036-2680			PHAM, LEDA T	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
	2834			
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
06/01/2009	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/573,634	<b>Applicant(s)</b> NAKAJIMA, TSUYOSHI
	<b>Examiner</b> LEDA PHAM	<b>Art Unit</b> 2834

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 April 2009.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-3,5-9 and 19-22 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 4 and 18 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) 10-17 is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 18 June 2008 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/06)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/28/06

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Election/Restrictions***

1. Applicant's election without traverse of group III, claims 4 and 10-18, in the reply filed on 4/27/09 is acknowledged.
2. Claims 1-3, 5-9, and 19-22 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to nonelected inventions, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hibner et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,110,257).

Regarding claim 4, Hibner teaches a system (fig 1-2) comprising an electric motor (10) for a vehicle (aircraft) that supplies a driving force for the vehicle by rotating a rotating shaft (34), roller bearings (46) that rotatably support the rotating shaft (34), a housing (66) that supports the roller bearings (46), a circular-shaped member (68) that creates an oil film between at least one of the roller bearings (46) and the housing (66), and an oil pump (48) that supplies oil to the circular-shaped member (68), wherein the oil pump (48) increases the supply of the oil when the rotating shaft rotates at a relatively high rotational velocity (col 7 In 20-27).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

7. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hibner in view of Shimuzu et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0149511 A1).

Regarding claim 18, Hibner teaches the claimed invention as set forth in claim 4, except for the added limitation of the system further comprising a reduction gear and a case contains the reduction gear.

Shimuzu teaches a system (fig 3, fig 7) having a reduction gear (230) which transmits driving torque of a electric motor (220) for a vehicle to a set of driving wheels (W, fig 3), and a case (250, fig 7) which contains the reduction gear (230) and connects an end of a rotating shaft (140) that is adjacent to a circular-shaped member (261) to

the reduction gear (230) and discharges the oil into the case to prevent an increase in bending moment of rotational shaft.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system with a reduction gear and a case containing the reduction gear as taught by Shimuzu. Doing so would accurately detect amount and direction of rotational torque acting on the rotation shaft.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

8. Claims 10-17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim 4, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

9. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the record of prior art by itself or in combination with other references does not teach the system having a control element that controls the supply of the oil and increases the supply when the rotational velocity of the rotating shaft is at least a threshold rotating value and a load on the rotating shaft is a threshold loading value or lower.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LEDA PHAM whose telephone number is 571-272-5806. The examiner can normally be reached on Normally M-f (8:00-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Quyen P. Leung can be reached on 571-272-8188. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Quyen Leung/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2834

/LEDA PHAM/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2834